Serial No.: 09/822,292 Attorney's Docket No.: BS01-019

Art Unit: 2685

Page 12

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

The application as filed included 39 claims. In the Office Action, the Examiner made final a restriction requirement that was mailed on February 11, 2004, pursuant to which Applicants had provisionally elected with traverse Claims 1-27 for examination. Accordingly, in the Office Action, Claims 28-39 were withdrawn from consideration for examination, and Claims 1-27 were examined. Claims 1-9 and 13-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,122,503 to Daly ("Daly"). Claims 10-12, 19, and 20-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daly.

In the present Amendment, the specification has been amended to correct typographical errors. Claims 1, 14, and 20 have been amended to recite additional features of the present invention. Claims 3 and 16 have been amended to correct matters of form. Claim 18 has been cancelled.

A distinguishing feature of the present invention, as recited in amended Claim 1, is a method to send updated information to a subscriber's wireless device only upon autonomous registration by the wireless user ("transmitting a third item of information to the wireless device only in response to the receipt of the second item of information") and only if the device belongs to a group of devices targeted to receive the update ("and only if the wireless device is associated with a targeted subscriber in the concerned database"). Until the device sends an autonomous registration that is received by a system used to provide the updates, the system does not attempt

Serial No.: 09/822,292 Attorney's Docket No.: BS01-019

Art Unit: 2685 Page 13

to contact the device or mobile switching center (MSC) associated with the device to send an updated message. In cases where there are large numbers of wireless devices potentially targeted for receiving an update, this feature acts to alleviate a bottleneck that could occur between various parts of a mobile communications system, such as a home location register, MSCs, or wireless devices, when a system attempts to contact such a large group of devices at the same time. The invention thus provides an efficient and timely method for sending updated information useful to a wireless device operation, without burdening a system or network with simultaneous and possibly unnecessary attempts at updating a plurality of subscribers' devices.

Independent claims 14 and 20 are amended to recite the same additional features as discussed for Claim 1 above. Claim 14 includes "receiving an autonomous registration event by the wireless device, wherein the wireless device is associated with a subscriber belonging to a group of targeted subscribers...and transmitting information to the wireless device only in response to the autonomous registration." Claim 20 provides "wherein the system sends information to a wireless device targeted to receive updated information *only* in response to an autonomous registration by the wireless device."

In contrast, while Daly teaches a method of updating information in a wireless device, the system in Daly attempts to send an updating message whenever it determines that the wireless device is a candidate for updating (column 5, line 58 to column 6, line 9). A home location register signals a database containing updated information to transfer the updated information to an MSC and then to a wireless device. The method taught by Daly thus runs the risk of causing extreme communications bottlenecks in the case where large groups of wireless devices are

Serial No.: 09/822,292

Art Unit: 2685

Attorney's Docket No.: BS01-019

Page 14

targeted for updating. Additionally, the above process taught by Daly operates in vain if the mobile phone is not registered when the process is initiated (column 6, lines 1-9). Thus, Daly teaches away from the present invention as recited in the amended independent Claims 1, 14, and 20. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1, 14, and 20 are in allowable condition. Moreover, at least for their dependence on allowable claims, all the remaining claims are believed to be in allowable condition.

In view of the foregoing, all of the claims in this case are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions or determine that any further action is desirable to place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

SHAW PITTMAN LLP 1650 Tysons Boulevard McLean, VA 22102

Tel: 703/770-7900

Date: March 29, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

CHARLES M. LINK, II, ET

By: Aslan Baghdadi

Registration No. 34,542

AB/RAR/lrhi

Customer No. 28970